[29th November 1928

A.—(*a*) Yes.

(*b*) *to* (*d*) At resettlement an extent of 127·04 acres was described as grazing poramboke. Of this area 78·94 acres have since been transferred to ayan and 4·93 acres to house-site poramboke for assignment to Adi-Dravidas. In addition to the 43·17 acres still remaining registered as grazing ground poramboke, an extent of 233·41 acres of tank-bed land in the Paranji Eri is available for grazing.

Mr. T. Adinarayana Chettiyar :—" Is it not a fact that at the resettlement land has been set apart which is available for assignment to the Adi-Dravidas without encroaching upon grazing poramboke ? "

The hon. Sir Norman Marjoribanks :—" Not in that village."

Mr. T. Adinarayana Chettiyar :—" May I know whether in any other village at least in North Arcot district such land is made available and, if so, why ? "

The hon. Sir Norman Marjoribanks :—" I am not aware that in any village where such land is available any transfer from grazing ground to ayan was made."

Transfer of grazing lands to 'Ayan' in North Arcot district.

* 884-B *Q.*—Mr. T. Adinarayana Chettiyar : Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether it is a fact that lands reserved for grazing in most villages in North Arcot district have been transferred to 'Ayan' and assigned on *pattas* during the last two years ;

(*b*) whether it is a fact that the present Collector of North Arcot district has been following this policy systematically ;

(*c*) whether it is a fact that, when the ryots objected to this policy of assignment, the District Collector advised the ryots to graze their cattle in their *patta* lands ;

(*d*) whether it is a fact that survey Nos. 37 and 377 in Raghunadasamudram village, Wandiwash taluk, North Arcot district, originally set apart for grazing were recently ordered by the present Collector to be transferred to *ayan* ; and

(*e*) whether Government will be pleased to call for a report on such transfers, if any, of grazing lands to *ayan* during the two years ending 30th September 1928 ?

A.—(*a*) The only information available with the Government relates to Paravattur village, Arkonam taluk This information is given in the answer to question No. 884-A. 1161.

(*b*) The Government presume that the Collector of North Arcot is following the policy outlined in G.O. No. 3034, Revenue, dated 24th August 1918, which was laid on the Council table on 26th August 1927.

(*c*) & (*d*) The Government have not the information asked for.

29th November 1928]

(e) The Government do not propose to call for a report in view of the orders in G.O. No. 3034, Revenue, dated 24th August 1918. They will always be prepared to consider individual cases on their merits if the parties concerned feel it necessary to appeal from any orders of the local authorities and the Board of Revenue.

Assignment of waste lands in Kaikalur taluk, Kistna district.

885 Q.—Mr. A. KALESWARA RAO: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) the extent of Government assessed waste fit for wet cultivation in Kaikalur taluk, Kistna district, excluding Kollair region;

(b) the extent of Government assessed waste in Kollair region in the said taluk; and

(c) whether the Government intend to assign these lands on darkhast for cultivation purposes to people of all castes and creeds who own no lands?

A.—(a) & (b) The figures asked for are not available and would have to be specially compiled.

(c) Assessed waste is ordinarily available on darkhast. A scheme for irrigating the waste lands in certain villages of the Kaikalur taluk is under investigation and should the scheme prove feasible and remunerative the lands will be sold. Meantime they are not available on darkhast.

Mr. A. KALESWARA RAO:—"May I know who is investigating into this question and at what stage it is?"

The hon. Sir NORMAN MARJORIBANKS:—"The Public Works Department."

Assignment of kumki lands in South Kanara district.

* 886-A Q.—Mr. K. R. KARANT: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) the number and extent of kumki lands in South Kanara talukwar which have been assigned away by Government to third parties against the consent of the owner of the wargs to which they are kumki in each of the last five years;

(b) on what grounds the Government justify such assignments;

(c) whether Government received any complaints from people of South Kanara against such assignments as unjust; and

(d) whether Government propose to put a stop to such a practice in the future at least?

A.—(a) The Government have not the details asked for, as the rules do not require the consent of the wargdar to the assignment of kumki lands.

(b) to (d) The Government have received a memorial setting out certain grievances in regard to the treatment of kumki and waste lands. A report has been called for from the Board of Revenue.